UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/447,443 | 11/22/1999 | PRASANTA BEHERA | NETS0059 | 3814 |

22862        7590        01/02/2003

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY
SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA  94025

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| DODDS, HAROLD E |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2177 | |

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|---|---|---|
| | 09/447,443 | BEHERA, PRASANTA |
| | **Examiner** | **Art Unit** |
| | Harold E. Dodds, Jr. | 2177 |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 October 2002_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.    2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-27_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _22 November 1999_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

   If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All  b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

   a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.      Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Weschler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,470,332), Hann et al. (U.S. Patent No.

4,799,153), and Albrecht et al. (U.S. Patent No. (5,950,011).

3.      Weschler rendered obvious independent claims 1, 10, and 19 by the

following:

"...providing a user defined access control command attribute..." at col. 1, lines 55-59,

col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 57-61.

"...a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes..." at col. 4,

lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...providing a system administrator defined..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-

59.

"...read access control command..." at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7,

lines 56-59.

"...wherein said read access control command..." at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59,

and col. 7, lines 56-59.

"...resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes.." at col. 8, lines 10-15, col. 8,

lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59.

"...said read access control command..." at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col.

7, lines 56-59.

"...listing LDAP user attributes..." at col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59.

"...that said administrator has selected..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-59.

"...for user defined read access..." at col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 1-9, and col. 8, lines

56-59.

"...and said read access control command..." at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and

col. 7, lines 56-59.

"...referring to said user defined..." at col. 1, lines 55-59.

"...at runtime..." at col. 1, lines 55-59.

"...read access to said LDAP user attributes..."

Weschler does not teach the use of user identifications and the use of read lists.

4.     However, Hann teaches the use of user identifications as follows:

"...containing user identifications..." at col. 16, lines 16-21.

"...allowing said read user identifications..." at col. 7, lines 30-33 and col. 16, lines 16-

21.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use user identifications in order have a method of determining which users

were authorized to use the system.

Hann does not teach the use of read lists.

5.    However, Albrecht teaches the use of read lists as follows:

"...read list..." at col. 10, lines 18-23.

"...that are allowed to read..." at col. 2, lines 26-32.

"...read list..." at col. 10, lines 18-23.

"...read access to said user attributes..." at col. 9, lines 57-58.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to be able to read a user defined list in order to select entries in the list for

further processing.

6.    Weschler rendered obvious independent claims 5, 14, and 23 by the

following:

"...providing a system administrator defined read access control command..." at col. 1,

lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 3-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 57-61.

"...that lists Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) user attributes..." at col. 4,

lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...that said administrator has selected..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-57.

"...for user defined read access..." at col. 1, lines 55-57, col. 8, lines 3-9, and col. 8, lines

56-59.

"...providing a system administrator defined..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-

57.

"...write access control command..." at col. 8, lines 3-9, col. 8, lines 55-59, and col. 7,

lines 57-61.

"...that lists LDAP user attributes..." at col. 4, lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...that said administrator has selected..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-57.

"...for user defined write access..." at col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 39-, and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...providing a plurality of user defined..." at col. 1, lines 55-59.

"...access control command attribute..." at col. 8, lines 55-59 and col. 7, lines 57-61.

"...said LDAP user attributes..." at col. 4, lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...that said administrator has selected..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-57.

"...for user defined read access..." at col. 1, lines 55-57, col. 8, lines 3-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...and providing a plurality of user defined..." at col. 1, lines 55-59.

"...access control command attribute..." at col. 8, lines 55-59 and col. 7, lines 57-61.

"...said LDAP user attributes..." at col. 4, lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...that said administrator has selected..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-57.

"...for user defined write access..." at col. 1, lines 55-57, col. 8, lines 3-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...wherein said read access control command and said write access control command..." at col. 8, lines 3-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 57-61.

"...reside in a directory containing said LDAP user attributes..." at col. 8, lines 10-15, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59.

"...wherein when a client read access... at col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 3-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...to one of the LDAP user attributes..." at col. 4, lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...that said administrator has selected..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-57.

"...for user defined read access occurs..." at col. 1, lines 55-57, col. 8, lines 3-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...said read access control command..." at col. 8, lines 3-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 57-61.

"...of the attribute being accessed..." at col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...said read access..." at col. 8, lines 1-9 and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...and wherein when a client write access..." at col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 3-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...to one of the LDAP user attributes..." at col. 4, lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...that said administrator has selected..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-57.

"...for user defined write access occurs..." at col. 1, lines 55-57, col. 8, lines 3-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...said write access control command..." at col. 8, lines 3-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 57-61.

"...of the attribute being accessed..." at col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...said write  access..." at col. 8, lines 1-9 and col. 8, lines 56-59.

Weschler does not teach the lists of user identifications, the use of owners, the use of read lists, and the use of write lists.

7.      However, Hann teaches the use of user identifications as follows:

"...containing user identifications..." at col. 16, lines 16-21.

"...containing user identifications..." at col. 16, lines 16-21.

"...of the owner..." at col. 16, lines 20-21 and col. 7, lines 36-39.

"...of the owner..." at col. 16, lines 20-21 and col. 7, lines 36-39.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use user identifications in order have a method of determining which users were authorized to use the system. Likewise, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to allow certain users to own attributes in order to restrict use of these attributes to users that have permission of the owner to use the owned attributes.

Hann does not teach the use of read lists and the use of write lists.

8.      However, Albrecht teaches the use of read lists and the use of write lists as follows:

"...read lists..." at col. 10, lines 18-23.

"...that are allowed to read..." at col. 2, lines 26-32.

"...write lists..." at col. 2, lines 26-32 and col. 10, lines 18-23.

"...that are allowed to write..." at col. 2, lines 26-32.

"...and the read list..." at col. 10, lines 18-23.

"...are used to determine if said client has permission to execute..." at col. 21, lines 61-65 and col. 13, lines 31-34.

"...and the write list..."

"...are used to determine if said client has permission to execute..." at col. 21, lines 61-65 and col. 13, lines 31-34.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to be able to read using a user-defined list in order to select entries in the list for further processing and to write using a user-defined list in order to complete processing entities on the list.

9.      Weschler rendered obvious independent claims 6, 15, and 24 by the following:

"...providing a user defined access control command attribute..." at col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 57-61.

"...a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes..." at col. 4, lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59.

"...providing a system administrator defined..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-59.

"...write access control command..." at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59.

"...wherein said write access control command..." at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59.

"...resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes.." at col. 8, lines 10-15, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59.

"...said write access control command..." at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59.

"...listing LDAP user attributes..." at col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59.

"...that said administrator has selected..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-59.

"...for user defined write access..." at col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 1-9, and col. 8,

lines 56-59.

"...and said write access control command..." at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and

col. 7, lines 56-59.

"...referring to said user defined..." at col. 1, lines 55-59.

"...at runtime..." at col. 1, lines 55-59.

"...write access to said LDAP user attributes..."

Weschler does not teach the use of user identifications and the use of write lists.

10.     However, Hann teaches the use of user identifications as follows:

"...containing user identifications..." at col. 16, lines 16-21.

"...allowing said write user identifications..." at col. 7, lines 30-33 and col. 16, lines 16-

21.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to use user identifications in order have a method of determining which users

were authorized to use the system.

Hann does not teach the use of write lists.

11.     However, Albrecht teaches the use of write lists as follows:

"...write list..." at col. 2, lines 26-32 and col. 10, lines 18-23.

"...that are allowed to write..." at col. 2, lines 26-32.

"...write list..." at col. 2, lines 26-32 and col. 10, lines 18-23.

"...write access to said user attributes..." at col. 10, lines 57-61 and col. 9, lines 57-58.

It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to be able to write to a user defined list in order to complete processing entries

in the list.

12.     As per claims 2, 11, and 20, the "...read access access control

command...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 57-59, and col. 7,

lines 56-59,

the "...according to the attribute being accessed...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines

57-59,

the "...refers to the read list...," is taught by Albrecht at col. 10, lines 18-23,

the "...list of the owner...," is taught by Hann at col. 16, lines 20-21 and col. 7, lines 36-

39,

the "...of the attribute being accessed...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 57-59,

the "...to determine if said client has permission to execute...," is taught by Albrecht at

col. 21, lines 61-65 and col. 13, lines 31-34,

and the "...read access...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 1-9 and col. 8, lines 56-

59.

13.     As per claims 3, 12, and 21, the "...providing a user defined...," is taught

by Weschler at col. 1, lines 55-59,

the "...write list...," is taught by Albrecht at col. 2, lines 26-32 and col. 10, lines 18-22,

the "...containing user identifications...," is taught by Hann at col. 16, lines 16-21,

the "...that are allowed to write a specified set of attributes...," is taught by Weschler at

col. 8, lines 3-9,

the "...providing a system administrator defined...," is taught by Weschler at col. 2, lines

35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-59,

the "...write access control command...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8,

lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59,

the "...write access control command...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8,

lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59,

the "...listing the user attributes...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 56-59 and col.

7, lines 56-59,

the "...said administrator has selected...," is taught by Weschler at col. 2, lines 35-37

and col. 1, lines 55-59,

the "...for user defined write access...," is taught by Weschler at col. 1, lines 55-59, col.

8, lines 1-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59,

the "...write access control command referring to...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8,

lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59,

the "...user defined...," is taught by Weschler at col. 1, lines 55-59,

the "...write list...," is taught by Albrecht at col. 2, lines 26-32 and col. 10, lines 18-22,

the "...user identifications...," is taught by Hann at col. 16, lines 16-21,

and the "...write access to said user attributes...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines

56-59 and col. 7, lines 56-59.

     14.    As per claims 4, 13, and 22, the "...write access control command...," is

taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 57-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59,

the "...according to the attribute being accessed...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 57-59,

the "...refers to the write list...," is taught by Cutler at col. 23, lines 58-60,

the "...list of the owner...," is taught by Hann at col. 16, lines 20-21 and col. 7, lines 36-39,

the "...of the attribute being accessed...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 57-59,

the "...to determine if said client has permission to execute...," is taught by Albrecht at col. 21, lines 61-65 and col. 13, lines 31-34,

and the "...write access..," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 1-9 and col. 8, lines 56-59.

15.     As per claims 7, 16, and 25, the "...write access control command...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 57-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59,

the "...according to the attribute being accessed...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 57-59,

the "...refers to the write list...," is taught by Cutler at col. 23, lines 58-60,

the "...list of the owner...," is taught by Hann at col. 16, lines 20-21 and col. 7, lines 36-39,

the "...of the attribute being accessed...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 57-59,

the "...to determine if said client has permission to execute...," is taught by Albrecht at col. 21, lines 61-65 and col. 13, lines 31-34,

and the "...write access..," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 1-9 and col. 8, lines 56-59.

16.     As per claims 8, 17, and 26, the "...providing a user defined...," is taught

by Weschler at col. 1, lines 55-59,

the "...read list...," is taught by Albrecht at col. 10, lines 18-22,

the "...containing user identifications...," is taught by Hann at col. 16, lines 16-21,

the "...that are allowed to read a specified set of attributes...," is taught by Weschler at

col. 8, lines 3-9,

the "...providing a system administrator defined...," is taught by Weschler at col. 2, lines

35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-59,

the "...read access control command...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8,

lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59,

the "...read access control command...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8,

lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59,

the "...listing the user attributes...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 56-59 and col.

7, lines 56-59,

the "...said administrator has selected...," is taught by Weschler at col. 2, lines 35-37

and col. 1, lines 55-59,

the "...for user defined read access...," is taught by Weschler at col. 1, lines 55-59, col.

8, lines 1-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59,

the "...read access control command referring to...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines

1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59,

the "...user defined...," is taught by Weschler at col. 1, lines 55-59,

the "...read list...," is taught by Albrecht at col. 10, lines 18-22,

the "...user identifications...," is taught by Hann at col. 16, lines 16-21,

and the "...read access to said user attributes...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines

56-59 and col. 7, lines 56-59.

17.    As per claims 9, 18, and 27, the "...read access access control

command...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 57-59, and col. 7,

lines 56-59,

the "...according to the attribute being accessed...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines

57-59,

the "...refers to the read list...," is taught by Albrecht at col. 10, lines 18-23,

the "...list of the owner...," is taught by Hann at col. 16, lines 20-21 and col. 7, lines 36-

39,

the "...of the attribute being accessed...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 57-59,

the "...to determine if said client has permission to execute...," is taught by Albrecht at

col. 21, lines 61-65 and col. 13, lines 31-34,

and the "...read access...," is taught by Weschler at col. 8, lines 1-9 and col. 8, lines 56-

59.

### *Response to Arguments*

18.    Applicant's arguments filed 10 October 2002 have been fully considered

but they are not persuasive. In the first argument on page 9, paragraph 2 for

independent claims 1, 10, and 19, the Applicant states as follows:

"In particular, neither Liles, Albrecht, Janis, nor Cutler, teach, describe, or contemplate
a system that provides a user defined access control command attribute read list
containing user identifications that are allowed to read a specified set of Lightweight

Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes as claimed in the invention. Nor do the cited references teach, describe, or contemplate a system that provides a system administrator defined read access control command, wherein the read access control command resides in a directory containing the LDAP attributes as claimed in the invention. Neither Liles, Albrecht, Janis, nor Cutler attempt to address the problems associated with millions of LDAP entries on an LDAP server with millions of access control commands and therefore do not contemplate the invention as claimed."

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "with millions of LDAP entries on an LDAP server with millions of access control commands") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Weschler teaches "...providing a user defined access control command attribute..." at col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 57-61 and "...a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes..." at col. 4, lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59; Hann teaches "...containing user identifications..." at col. 16, lines 16-21 ; and Albrecht teaches "...read list..." at col. 10, lines 18-23 and "...that are allowed to read..." at col. 2, lines 26-32. Likewise, Weschler teaches "...providing a system administrator defined..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-59 and "...read access control command..." at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59, "...wherein said read access control command..." at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59, and "...resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes.." at col. 8, lines 10-15, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59.. It is

clear, that independent claims 1, 10, and 19 are rendered obvious by the combined

teachings of Weschler, Hann, and Albrecht.

19.     In the second argument on page 10, paragraph 1 for independent claims

1, 10, and 19, the Applicant states as follows:

"To combine Liles, Albrecht, Janis, and Cutler based on singular terms such as "user defined", "access control command", and "read access" as the Office Action suggests requires information gleaned from the present invention. Such use of hindsight is impermissible."

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of

obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that

any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon

hindsight reasoning.  But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was

within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does

not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a

reconstruction is proper.  See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA

1971).

20.     In the third argument on page 11, paragraph 3 and page 12 paragraph 1

for independent claims 6, 15, and 24, the Applicant states as follows:

"As with Claims 1, 10, and 19, above, neither Liles, Albrecht, Janis, nor Cutler, teach, describe, or contemplate a system that provides a user defined access control command attribute write list containing user identifications that are allowed to write a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes, provides a system administrator defined write access control command, and wherein the write access control command resides in a directory containing the LDAP attributes as claimed in the invention. Neither Liles, Albrecht, Janis, nor Cutler attempt to address the problems associated with millions of LDAP entries on an LDAP server with millions of access control commands and therefore do not contemplate the invention as claimed."

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "with millions of LDAP entries on an LDAP server with millions of access control commands") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Weschler teaches "...providing a user defined access control command attribute..." at col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 57-61, "...a specified set of Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) attributes..." at col. 4, lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59, "...providing a system administrator defined..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-59, "...write access control command..." at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59, "...wherein said write access control command..." at col. 8, lines 1-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59, and "...resides in a directory containing said LDAP attributes.." at col. 8, lines 10-15, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59; Hann teaches "...containing user identifications..." at col. 16, lines 16-21; and Albrecht teaches "...write list..." at col. 2, lines 26-32 and col. 10, lines 18-23 and "...that are allowed to write..." at col. 2, lines 26-32.

21.    In the fourth argument on page 12, paragraph 5 for claims 2, 11, and 20, the Applicant states as follows:

"The rejection of Claims 2, 11, and 20 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks regarding Claims C above. Claims 2, 11, and 20 are dependent upon independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, which are in allowable condition.
Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)."

Since independent claims 1, 10, and 19 have been rendered obvious by the responses

to arguments 1 and 2, upon which claims 2, 11, and 20 depend and no new arguments

have been provided for these claims, then claims 2, 11, and 20 are also rendered

obvious.

22.     In the fifth argument on page 12, paragraph 7 for claims 3, 12, and 21, the

Applicant states as follows:

"The rejection of Claims 3, 12, and 21 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks
regarding Claims 1, 10, and 19, above. Claims 3, 12, and 21 are dependent upon
independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, which are in allowable condition.
Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection
under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)."

Since independent claims 1, 10, and 19 have been rendered obvious by the responses

to arguments 1 and 2, upon which claims 3, 12, and 21 depend and no new arguments

have been provided for these claims, then claims 3, 12, and 21 are also rendered

obvious.

23.     In the sixth argument on page 13, paragraph 1 for claims 4, 13, and 22,

the Applicant states as follows:

"The rejection of Claims 4, 13, and 22 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks
regarding Claims 1, 10, and 19, above. Claims 4, 13, and 22 are dependent upon
independent Claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively, which are in allowable condition.
Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection
under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)."

Since independent claims 1, 10, and 19 have been rendered obvious by the responses

to arguments 1 and 2, upon which claims 4, 13, and 22 depend and no new arguments

have been provided for these claims, then claims 4, 13, and 22 are also rendered

obvious.

24.    In the seventh argument on page 13, paragraph 3 for claims 7, 16, and 25,

the Applicant states as follows:

"The rejection of Claims 7, 16, and 25 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks
regarding Claims 6, 15, and 24, above. Claims 7, 16, and 25 are dependent upon
independent Claims 6, 15, and 24, respectively, which are in allowable condition.
Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection
under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)."

Since independent claims 6, 15, and 24 have been rendered obvious by the responses

to argument 3, upon which claims 7, 16, and 25 depend and no new arguments have

been provided for these claims, then claims 7, 16, and 25 are also rendered obvious.

25.    In the eighth argument on page 13, paragraph 5 for claims 8, 17, and 26,

the Applicant states as follows:

"The rejection of Claims 8, 17, and 26 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks
regarding Claims 6, 15, and 24, above. Claims 8, 17, and 26 are dependent upon
independent Claims 6, 15, and 24, respectively, which are in allowable condition.
Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection
under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)."

Since independent claims 6, 15, and 24 have been rendered obvious by the responses

to argument 3, upon which claims 8, 17, and 26 depend and no new arguments have

been provided for these claims, then claims 8, 17, and 26  are also rendered obvious.

26.    In the ninth argument on page 13, paragraph 7 for claims 9, 18, and 27,

the Applicant states as follows:

"The rejection of Claims 9, 18, and 27 is deemed moot in view of Applicant's remarks
regarding Claims 6, 15, and 24, above. Claims 9, 18, and 27 are dependent upon
independent Claims 6, 15, and 24, respectively, which are in allowable condition.
Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection
under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)."

Since independent claims 6, 15, and 24 have been rendered obvious by the responses

to argument 3, upon which claims 9, 18, and 27 depend and no new arguments have

been provided for these claims, then claims 9, 18, and 27 are also rendered obvious.

     27.    In the tenth argument on page 16, paragraph 2 and page 17, paragraphs

1 and 2 for claims 5, 14, and 23, the Applicant states as follows:

"As with Claims 1, 10, and 19, above, neither Janis, Albrecht, Liles, nor Cutler, teach,
describe, or contemplate a system that provides a system administrator defined read
access control command that lists Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) user
attributes that the administrator has selected for user defined read access, provides a
system administrator defined write access control command that lists LDAP user
attributes that the administrator has selected for user defined write access, and wherein
the read access control command and the write access control command reside in a
directory containing the LDAP attributes as claimed in the invention. Further, neither
Janis, Albrecht, Liles, nor Cutler, teach, describe, or contemplate a system that provides
a plurality of user defined access control command attribute read lists containing user
identifications that are allowed to read the LDAP user attributes that said administrator
has selected for user defined read access, provides a plurality of user defined access
control command attribute write lists containing user identifications that are allowed to
write the LDAP user attributes that said administrator has selected for user defined write
access as claimed in the invention.
As stated above, neither Liles, Albrecht, Janis, nor Cutler attempt to address the
problems associated with millions of LDAP entries on an LDAP server with millions of
access control commands and therefore do not contemplate the invention as claimed."

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., "with millions of LDAP entries on an LDAP server with millions of access control

commands") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted

in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

Weschler teaches "...providing a system administrator defined read access

control command..." at col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 3-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7,

lines 57-61, "...that lists Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) user attributes..."

at col. 4, lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59, "...that said administrator has selected..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-57, "...for user defined read access..." at col. 1, lines 55-57, col. 8, lines 3-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59, "...providing a system administrator defined..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-57, "...write access control command..." at col. 8, lines 3-9, col. 8, lines 55-59, and col. 7, lines 57-61, "...that lists LDAP user attributes..." at col. 4, lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59, "...that said administrator has selected..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-57, "...for user defined write access..." at col. 1, lines 55-59, col. 8, lines 39-, and col. 8, lines 56-59, "...wherein said read access control command and said write access control command..." at col. 8, lines 3-9, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 57-61, and "...reside in a directory containing said LDAP user attributes..." at col. 8, lines 10-15, col. 8, lines 56-59, and col. 7, lines 56-59.

Weschler teaches "...providing a plurality of user defined..." at col. 1, lines 55-59, "...access control command attribute..." at col. 8, lines 55-59 and col. 7, lines 57-61, "...said LDAP user attributes..." at col. 4, lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59, "...that said administrator has selected..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-57, "...for user defined read access..." at col. 1, lines 55-57, col. 8, lines 3-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59, "...and providing a plurality of user defined..." at col. 1, lines 55-59, "...access control command attribute..." at col. 8, lines 55-59 and col. 7, lines 57-61, "...said LDAP user attributes..." at col. 4, lines 61-63 and col. 8, lines 56-59 "...that said administrator has selected..." at col. 2, lines 35-37 and col. 1, lines 55-57, and "...for user defined write access..." at col. 1, lines 55-57, col. 8, lines 3-9, and col. 8, lines 56-59; Hann teaches

"...containing user identifications..." at col. 16, lines 16-21; and Albrecht teaches "...read

lists..." at col. 10, lines 18-23 and "...that are allowed to read..." at col. 2, lines 26-32. It

is clear, that independent claims 5, 14, and 23 are rendered obvious by the combined

teachings of Weschler, Hann, and Albrecht.

28.    In the eleventh argument on page 17, paragraph 3 for claims 5, 14, and

23, the Applicant states as follows:

"To combine Janis, Albrecht, Liles, and Cutler based on singular terms such as

"administrator has selected", "access control command", "read list", "for user defined",

and "read access" as the Office Action suggests requires information gleaned from the

present invention. Such use of hindsight is impermissible."

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of

obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that

any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon

hindsight reasoning.  But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was

within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does

not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a

reconstruction is proper.  See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA

1971).

### Conclusion

29.    Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection

presented in this Office action.  Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**  See

MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

30.     Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harold E. Dodds, Jr. whose telephone number is (703)-305-1802. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (703)-305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-

305-3900.

*Harold E. Dodds, Jr.*

Harold E. Dodds, Jr.
Patent Examiner
December 30, 2002

GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER